

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **20 September 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-27. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saleh et al (USPub 2001/0033548, hereinafter "Saleh").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Saleh. Applicant respectfully points out that Saleh teaches a link state database, which is searched to find the **current link state advertisement** (LSA) to compare with the received LSA (see Saleh, paragraph [0099]). Note that the instant application refers to the LSA as a link stat packet (LSP).

In contrast, the present invention uses a bit record *R* to remember **the last N data packets** that have been received and to determine if the current data packet was received as one of the last N data packets (see FIGs. 2 and 3 and page 8, line 21 to page 10, line 8 of the instant application). In particular, note page 10, lines 4-8 of the instant application. This is beneficial because it allows out of order delivery of data packets to occur without adverse effect during message flooding. In the system of Saleh, the LSA messages are flooded only if the sequence number is higher than the stored current LSA. There is nothing within Saleh, either explicit or implicit, which suggests using a bit record *R* to remember the last N data packets that have been received and to determine if the current data packet was received as one of the last N data packets.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention uses a bit record *R* to remember the last N data packets that have been received and to determine if the current data packet was received as one of the last N data packets. These amendments find support in FIGs. 2 and 3 and on page 8, line 21 to page 10, line 8 of the instant application.


Claims 3, 7, 12, 16, 21, and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 4-6, 8, 13-15, 17, 22-24, and 26 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2, 4-6, and 8-9, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11, 13-14, and 17-18, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20, 22-24, and 26-27, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 7 November 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com